



2003 Limited English Proficient Student Census

MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The fall 2003 Limited English Proficient Student Census was again submitted via Internet, and is available at <http://k12apps.dese.mo.gov/webapps/logon.asp>. This census was conducted by school districts in Missouri from **October 20 to November 3, 2003**. Percent changes, where given, refer to the difference between the 2002 and 2003 figures. There were **470** out of 524 public school districts (**90%**) that reported back this year. The results show a **13%** increase in the total number of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students enrolled in **177** Missouri schools. State agencies (including DESE), Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), Local Education Agencies (LEAs), nonprofit organizations and many other interest groups utilize the data collected from this census for various purposes including the design of educational and service programs, publications, fund allocations, and the attraction of funds to the State of Missouri, including **Title III** funds of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. Inquiries regarding the database may be directed to Yaya Badji at 573-526-3232 or 573-522-1567, or yaya.badji@dese.mo.gov

DEFINITIONS

English Language Learner (ELL): This term refers to speakers of other languages in the process of learning English. This abbreviation may be used to indicate LEP students needing services.

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL): For perhaps the majority of educational contexts that include ELL students, an ESOL approach is the only practical one. This might be the case either because a qualified teacher who is fluent in both English and the student's other language is not available, or because there are so many other languages represented by students that having a bilingual teacher for each language is impractical. In Missouri, both of the above reasons, coupled with the relatively low numbers of students in the majority of districts enrolling ELL students, make ESOL the approach of choice. In addition, the only formal teaching recognition in Missouri is the ESOL endorsement; there is no bilingual certificate or endorsement.

"Bilingual Education" is a term that describes educational programs that explicitly include the student's native language in instruction.

MISSOURI MIGRANT EDUCATION AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING (MELL) PROGRAM

The Title I-C and Title III programs of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 have been reorganized in Missouri as the Missouri Migrant Education and English Language Learning (MELL) program. The reorganization has been in progress since the NCLB Act was signed. The MELL program is designed to provide extensive technical assistance in a timely manner to school districts. The program does not include direct services to the students. The state is divided into nine regions, and each region hosts a center located in a strategic city or town. The reorganization is to better serve English Language Learners (ELL) and migrant students with existing resources. The MELL program is designed to prevent the duplication of services, and to allow for most of the funds to reach the districts, the needy ELL children. There are nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) regions where MELL staff provide the service delivery. Each center (except two of very low incidence that are staffed with one person fulfilling both roles) is staffed with at least one recruiter and one instructional specialist. The Centers are located in Malden (Malden School District), Columbia (Columbia School District), Kansas City (University of Missouri-Kansas City), Kirksville (Truman State University), St. Joseph (St. Joseph Public Schools), Rolla (University of Missouri - Rolla), Monett (Monett School District), St. Louis (Cooperating School District) and Sedalia (Sedalia School District #200). The MELL director coordinates the nine regional centers, with an office located in Jefferson City. This coordinating office is under DESE's contract with the Jefferson City School District. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) funds the nine MELL centers and the coordinating office through contracts. DESE also allocates funding to school districts for direct services to the targeted students.

U.S. RESIDENCY AND IMMIGRATION

The Supreme Court ruled in *Plyler v. Doe* (1982) that legal residency in the United States is not a requirement for enrolling in a public school. Schools should not explicitly or implicitly ask for any information related to U.S. residency, including social security numbers, passports, visas, "green cards," and the like. Even if volunteered by parents, it is better to politely refuse such information. A student cannot be denied admission to school or participation in a program based on the student's undocumented status. Any such discrimination would be a denial of the equal protection of the law in violation of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

SUMMARY TOTALS

Percent changes, where given, refer to the difference between the 2002 and 2003 figures.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

| | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | % Change |
|----------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Public Schools | 7,679 | 8,157 | 10,238 | 11,535 | 13,121 | 14,855 | 13% |

These figures show an increase of more than 13 percent in the number of ELL students identified.

REGIONAL AND FACTUAL TOTALS

ELL Students in St. Louis and Kansas City Public Schools

| | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | % Change |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| St. Louis | 1,529 | 2,675 | 2,433 | 3,004 | 2,672 | 2,768 | 4% |
| Kansas City | 1,386 | 1,221 | 2,068 | 2,066 | 2,426 | 3,102 | 28% |

Below are a few of the districts that experienced high growth in the number of enrolling ELL students for one reason or another including their location as suburban and/or near processing plant districts.

ELL Students Enrolled in Some High Growth Districts

| School District | 2002 | 2003 | % Change |
|----------------------|------|------|----------|
| North Kansas City | 314 | 418 | 33% |
| Neosho R-V | 136 | 187 | 38% |
| Sedalia 200 | 151 | 180 | 19% |
| Park Hill | 201 | 223 | 11% |
| Francis Howell R-III | 112 | 160 | 43% |
| Hazelwood | 292 | 409 | 40% |
| Pattonville R-III | 143 | 224 | 57% |
| Rolla 31 | 8 | 45 | 463% |
| Belton | 83 | 105 | 27% |

Several factors contribute to the continued rise in the number of students from non-English language backgrounds, including:

- Growth of poultry processing, meat packing, and agricultural jobs
- Enrollment of foreign students at institutions of higher education
- Growth of Missouri economy and internationalization of business

SERVICE EXPECTATIONS

School districts are responsible for providing a language instruction educational program that increases the English proficiency and academic achievement of ELL students. This is true whether or not the districts receive funds from the state or federal level. The expectations are to hold ELL students to the State academic content and academic achievement standards established for all children. DESE has no mandated curriculum to serve ELL students. DESE, through the MELL program described above, can assist districts in developing their local plan for educating ELL students that allows for local variations while maintaining compliance with state and federal requirements. The districts have the students' results in terms of their language abilities. These are key factors in determining what kind of services to provide and how often to deliver them to reach the expectations that programs will enable children to **speak, write, listen, read** and **comprehend** the English language and meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. Schools are required to have a **two-year follow-up** after a child is no longer receiving services. In the Educating Linguistically Diverse Students handbook, there are expectations and a checklist that will help you evaluate your programs. Think about what you can do for all ELL students and what is specific to each child. Suggestions are in the handbook from instructional approaches to program evaluation and cultural considerations. The bottom line is

that the district is also looking at whether or not the ELL student is able to access the school's curriculum, with all of its cultural and social implications. School district policies, resources and context will influence the type of services. The district context will determine the approach and content as stated. However, the language instruction curriculum used must be tied to scientifically based research on teaching ELL students and must have demonstrated effectiveness, which involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to educational activities and programs. See **ESEA section 9101 (37) - page 969 - for the complete definition.**

PARENTAL LEGAL RIGHTS

Under Title III of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, schools are required to provide informed parental notification as to why their child is in need of placement in a specialized language instruction program. Parents have the right to choose among instruction programs if more than one type of program is offered. They must be informed no later than **30 days** after the **beginning** of the school year. During the school year, this time is **two weeks**. Parents also have the right to immediately remove their child from a program for ELL children. Schools are required to implement effective means of parental outreach to encourage parents to become informed and active participants in their child's participation in the English language instruction educational program. Since the legislation is silent on whether parents should be notified before assessing an ELL student, DESE does not require the district to seek parental authorization to test the children for ELL classification. Details on parental notification are located in the **Appendix E** of the Educating Linguistically Diverse Students handbook.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Unlike undocumented students, permanent resident aliens and other types of legal aliens residing in the United States, foreign exchange students do not have a legal right to attend American public schools. Schools have the discretion to enroll or not enroll them even though they may be treated like resident students during their attendance year. (INS's website says that they should be admitted pursuant to the school district's non-resident admissions policy - www.ins.gov). As temporary visitors who are not entitled to receive educational services, it is understood that the school has no obligation to evaluate them for English language proficiency. They may do so at their discretion. Schools should review their exchange student policies.

LANGUAGES SPOKEN

There are some 90 languages spoken by students in Missouri schools. While many of these languages claim only a few speakers, they represent the linguistic and cultural heritage that has always been present in the Midwest. The following chart presents the most commonly spoken languages and their growth over the last five school years:

Top Ten Languages Spoken in Missouri Schools

| Language | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | % Change (from 2000) |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| 1. Spanish | 3,065 | 4,625 | 5,098 | 6,264 | 7,545 | 20% |
| 2. Bosnian/Serbo/Croatian | 1,056 | 1,661 | 2,176 | 2,137 | 2,139 | .10% |
| 3. Vietnamese | 938 | 747 | 760 | 768 | 844 | 10% |
| 4. Arabic | 382 | 372 | 450 | 398 | 498 | 12% |
| 5. Somali | 508 | 367 | 379 | 437 | 492 | 13% |
| 6. Chinese | 263 | 237 | 335 | 355 | 353 | -.6% |
| 7. Russian | 153 | 232 | 266 | 318 | 347 | 9% |
| 8. Korean | 155 | 173 | 190 | 252 | 302 | 20% |
| 9. Farsi | - | 35 | 53 | 95 | 224 | 135% |
| 10. Albanian | - | 112 | 134 | 115 | 120 | 4% |

These language totals reflect a couple of factors mentioned above, the influx of refugees, and the expansion of labor attractive to migrant workers. It also suggests that some of the more "established" groups are either moving on, or their children are no longer considered "ELL," or both.

CONCLUSION

The improved data collection of information regarding ELL students is helping us to see where our priorities should lie. Continued rapid growth in some suburban and many rural areas requires that all schools be

prepared to meet ELL students' needs. Districts must adopt a plan to identify, assess and serve ELL students. Refer to the Educating Linguistically Diverse Students handbook for details.

Number of LEP Students by County

